DRAFT

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of March 13, 2006

Present were: Messer's Almeida, Batty, Cunha, O'Brien, Sullivan, Jeanne Boyle (staff), James Moran (staff).

1. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

   A. Minutes of February 13, 2006

   It was noted the minutes of February 13, 2006 would be forthcoming.

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

On a motion by Mr. Cunha, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board unanimously approved the correspondence below:

A. Memo dated March 7, 2006 to the City Council, Re: Appl. #2006-01, Walgreens, Street Abandonment – Portion of S. Blossom Street Recommendation

4. NEW BUSINESS

   A. Rezoning – Tristam Burgess Property – South Broadway, Map 207, Block 21, Parcel 1

   Mr. Moran presented the staff recommendation and explained that the City has been taking action to review City parcels that are no longer of needed in terms of their physical ability to serve the City. There was a long list of sites that were inclusive of the Tristam Burgess School site located on South Broadway.

   Mr. Moran said that six months ago, an RFP was put in the paper for proposals for redevelopment of this particular site. A number of proposals were received and the higher bidder was Michael West Builders, who had come in with a 1.2 million dollar bid to allow the development of a 16 unit multi-family development on the site. One of the issues that affected this site was that the current zoning of R-6 would not support multi-family development. As part of the Purchase and Sales Agreement, among other things was the proviso that the property be rezoned to support a multi-family use on the site. The City reviewed the various zones that could be developed on that site and the most appropriate one was the R-5 designation.

The property contains 40,814 square feet. It is fronted on four sides; South Broadway, Mason, Fort, and Public Streets. It has access to both sewer and water. It is a flat unvegetated site with the exception of the grass. He distributed a photo. The map gives an overlay of the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood. There is a building shown on the property that was the school building which has since been demolished. To the north, west and northeast of the site are designations R-4, R-6, and R-3. The subject property is now located as an R-6 designation. To the immediately southeast is a large area of R-5. That particular section of South Broadway is typically multi-family development. There is a small section of Commercial-2 north of the site, but not immediately adjacent to that site. The R-4, R-6, and R-3 within the Comprehensive Plan recommend densities of eight dwelling units per acre. The R-5 designation represents a higher density of development in the order of 60 dwelling units per acre. The Planning Department looked at a couple of issues that impacted the medium density development located around the parcel and we want to make certain that this is well buffered from potential impacts from the development and we would make sure that any impacts to the neighboring areas would be minimized through these buffers.

We looked at restricting access of this development from the neighborhood side. We looked to restrict access to this property on the South Broadway side to determine that the minimum amount of impacts is occurring from a traffic perspective on this site.

The P&S Agreement with the developer and the City mandates that the development be subject to complete review under the City's Development Plan Review Ordinances including the potential for the completion of a traffic impact analysis. We will have a traffic impact requirement for this development to ascertain impacts of the neighborhood from traffic. The project will be subject to this review regardless of mandate in the P&S agreement.

The applicant will obtain all necessary permits and variances to allow the construction of the 16 multi-unit. It will need to go through statutory review as part of this process if they are in need of a variance or additional permits as part of this review. It will undergo an architectural review as well to assure compatibility of abutting developments.

It is compatible with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. The Plan identifies this neighborhood as a Medium Density residential neighborhood which is defined in the Plan west of South Broadway and there is an adjacent to the site on the other side of the roadway is a high density which allows the 16 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Batty states that the developer is requesting 16 dwellings per acre. Mr. Moran states that it comes fairly close in approximating the requirement for that particular district in the R-5. The 15 dwelling units per acre approximate the requirement fairly closely. Ms. Boyle states that he will still have to do the

zoning calculations. There are multi-family zoning calculations and if does not meet them, then he will have to go before the Zoning Board.

Mr. Batty asks how many buildings will the developer build on the site? Mr. Moran states that in the P&S Agreement it says it will be 16, 2-bedroom units. It does not specify the number of buildings. Mr. Sullivan states that the 16 units have nothing to do with multi and asks if they could 16 individual buildings? Ms. Boyle clarified that it is a multi-family condo type development with 2 bedrooms. It would be impossible to fit 16 detached buildings onto the site. They have to be multi and attached. She said this will be going through a complete development plan review process which will include the layout of the development. If he does not meet the zoning requirements, then he will go before Zoning.

Mr. Almeida asks if the traffic/pedestrian crossing light will remain? He feels it should stay there. Ms. Boyle states that that will be addressed as part of the whole traffic impact study. She said the Board could make some stipulations to the Council so that they are conscious of the pedestrian access as far as a future development. She explained that the City Council is authorized to make limitations on the rezoning; it does not have to be a blanket R-5. I would like, as a stipulation, that the rezoning be tied into the whole development plan review process as well.

Mr. Moran states that part of the R-5 is also across the street and they could potentially develop that parcel as an R-5 and it would avoid the possibility of creating a spot zone.

Recommendation

Based upon a finding that the rezoning from Residential-6 to Residential 5 is consistent with the East Providence Comprehensive Plan and meets the purposes of Zoning as contained in Section 19-2 of the Zoning Ordinances and for the above stated reasons Planning staff recommends that the Board recommend to the City Council approval of this rezoning petition.

Mr. Batty asks if the Fire Department is aware of this? Ms. Boyle states yes and that the Public Safety Complex Study has not yet commenced as yet, but that this site would be taken off the table for consideration for a new fire station. When the Council deemed this surplus, that was something that was considered at that time.

Mr. Batty asks the Board if they have any stipulations? They would like the light to remain.

Motion
On a motion by Almeida, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, the Board recommends that the pedestrian light remains.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Sullivan`	Aye
Acting Chairman Batty	Aye

Motion - Rezoning of Property

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, the Board voted to recommend to the City Council that they rezone the property from Residential-6 to Residential-5 based on the Planning staff conditions.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Sullivan`	Aye
Acting Chairman Batty	Aye

5. CONTINUED BUSINESS

A. Draft Demolition Delay Ordinance – Historic Preservation

Ms. Boyle updated the Board and said there is no action on this item; it is just for the Board's information. She states that based upon the recommendation of the Planning Board on this matter, the Board has reviewed this draft ordinance and that there were a number of concerns because of its impact of a wide range of properties within the City and also some administrative issues. The Board had recommended that the City Council direct the Historic Properties Commission to work with the Planning Department in that regard. She informed the Board that the Council adopted the recommendation of the Planning Board and said that staff has been working with the Historic Properties Commission. We will be putting aside the demolition delay approach and focusing on some other mechanisms such as a Historic District zone for the Hunts Mills area.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Memo to the Zoning Board of Review Re: Meeting of February, 2006

On a motion by Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board unanimously voted to approve the above communication.

7. ANNOUNCEMENT

A. Next Meeting – Monday, April 10, 2006, 7:30 p.m., Room 306

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Burton Batty, Acting Chair

BB/JMB/sac